DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 308 769 HE 022 738

AUTHOR Kinnick, Mary K.; Ricks, Mary F.
TITLE The Urban Public University in the United States: An Analysis of Change, 1977-1987. AIR 1989 Annual Forum Paper.
PUB DATE May 89
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research (29th, Baltimore, MD, April 30-May 3, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Planning; College Programs; Economic Change; *Educational Change; *Enrollment Trends; Graduate Study; Higher Education; *Institutional Characteristics; Institutional Research; Minority Groups; *Public Colleges; Urban Demography; *Urban Universities
IDENTIFIERS *AIR Forum

ABSTRACT

Two surveys of urban public universities, conducted in 1978 and 1987, provide a rich database for analyzing and explaining change in these institutions over a 10-year period. Continuing an analysis of trends and conditions begun in 1987, data from a sample of urban universities are compared to those for higher education in general. Local demographic data an economic conditions are examined as possible causes of change or stability over the 10-year period. Results are discussed as they relate to access, enrollments, evening and weekend programs, minority participation, tuition and fees, graduate programs, graduate degrees, doctoral programs, and expenditures for research. Contains 12 references. (Author/KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

THE URBAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITY IN THE UNITED STATES: AN ANALYSIS OF CHANGE, 1977-1987

Mary K. Kinnick
Assistant Dean, School of Education
Portland State University
P. O. Box 751
Portland, Oregon 97207
(503) 464-4750

Mary F. Ricks
Director, Institutional Research and Planning
Portland State University
P. O. Box 751
Portland, Oregon 97207
(503) 464-3432

For Presentation to the
29th Annual Forum of the
Association for Institutional Research
Baltimore, MD
May 3, 1989

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AIR

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE 022 738

for Management Research, Policy Analysis, and Planning

This paper was presented at the Twenty-Ninth Annual Forum of the Association for Institutional Research held at the Omni Inner Harbor Hotel and the Lord Baltimore Hotel, Baltimore, Maryland, April 30 - May 3, 1989. This paper was reviewed by the AIR Forum Publications Committee and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC Collection of Forum Papers.

Teresa Karolewski
Chair and Editor
Forum Publications Editorial
Advisory Committee

THE URBAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITY IN THE UNITED STATES: AN ANALYSIS OF CHANGE, 1977-1987

ABSTRACT

Two surveys of urban public universities, conducted in 1978 and 1987, provide a rich data base for analyzing and explaining change in these institutions over a ten-year period. This report continues an analysis of trends and conditions begun in 1987. Data from a sample of urban institutions are compared to those for higher education in general; similarities and differences are noted. Local demographic data and economic conditions are examined as possible causes of change or stability over the ten-year period. Findings have implications for institutional planning, particularly as it occurs in urban environments.

THE URBAN PUBLIC UNIVERSITY IN THE UNITED STATES: AN ANALYSIS OF CHANGE, 1977-1987

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study has been to observe and analyze institutional development over a ten-year period among a group of 32 urban public universities. In this, the second in a series of reports, our primary interest is in examining two dimensions of institutional development: access and graduate education. Three areas of interest are addressed:

1. How have these 32 institutions changed along each of the two dimensions? Are there patterns of change that characterize this sub-set of higher education institutions? Can these urban public universities be considered a distinct grouping within higher education?
2. What factors account for these changes? Are they simply part of the larger patterns of change affecting all of higher education over the same ten-year period?
3. What factors account for differences in patterns of institutional development among these 32 institutions?

A primary motivation for pursuing this investigation has been to provide institutional researchers, planners and policy formulators and analysts with information which may lead to a greater understanding of patterns of development among this relatively young group of urban public universities. Is there something distinctive about these urban public universities that sets them apart from their sister institutions?

This study began in 1977, when the authors initiated a data exchange with 41 public urban institutions which were similar in several important characteristics to their own institution. Ten years later, the institutions were again surveyed. A large and rich data base now exists describing 32 of the original 41 institutions. A subset of information from this data base has been used for this, the second report to result from this continuing project.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature dealing with public urban universities is largely prescriptive and anecdotal. Some authors have articulated their visions of what an urban university should be. Others have described developments in the life of a particular urban university or a small group of urban universities (Klotschke, 1966; Blizek & Simpson, 1978; Spaights, 1980; Waetjen and Muffo, 1983; and Grobman & Sanders, 1984).

A recent study by Grobman (1988) compares selected characteristics of a sample of urban and non-urban state universities. The urban state universities are shown to be serving greater percentages of women, older students, minority group members, part-time students, commuters, and students enrolled in evening courses than are their non-urban counterparts. He suggests that the "urban state university", like the community college, is a new kind of institution in American higher education.

Berube (1978) has posited that urban universities, particularly the group that evolved from beginnings as municipal institutions or private city universities or from the expanded campuses of existing state university systems, are a new form of American higher education institution, different from those whose origins were more Newmanian (adhering to the traditional "liberal arts" orientation) or Germanic (with a strong research emphasis). The distinguishing feature of these new institutions, according to Berube, is their focus on the university as servant of society.

Ricks, Kinnick and Pilip (1988), reported the following characteristics of a group of 32 urban public universities:

* while most used the terms "comprehensive" and "urban public university" in their mission and/or goal statements, the emphasis given to the traditional roles of teaching, research and service was most striking; while the statements provide some variation on an urban theme, the impression left is more one of differences than similarities in mission or goal emphasis (pp.15-16);
* there is evidence that these institutions have been very strongly affected by the economic conditions of the region in which they are located;
* most had instituted a substantial number of new degree programs; most of the new doctoral programs were in applied or interdisciplinary fields;
* federal grants and contracts to the institutions had, by and large, increased substantially;
* fewer formal and informal linkages between the universities and other institutions and agencies in their region were reported than expected (perhaps because respondents may not have been familiar with this information about their institution);
* most had new facilities under construction;
* most reported an increase in student average age; and,
* faculty size at most institutions had increased.

Two subsets of these institutions were examined, one made up of eight institutions that had experienced significant enrollment growth, and a second composed of eight institutions that had experienced a decline in enrollment, in an effort to discover factors which could account for the different enrollment patterns. Most factors examined, including local population growth, did not distinguish between the two groups. A number of respondents indicated that enrollment at their institutions increased because of program enhancements. The nature of the relationship, though, was unclear. Those institutions that experienced an enrollment increase reported a greater number of actions or activities initiated that were designed to expand enrollment: new program offerings or other aspects of institutional development; merger with another college; strong presidential leadership; addition of a medical complex; opening regional campuses; and increased marketing efforts. The authors acknowledged the limitations of using enrollment growth as an indicator of either "success" as an institution or as a single measure of institutional development. The observation was made that the institutions studied appear to lie along a continuum. At one end was the research-oriented university and at the other end, the institution oriented toward outreach and service.

This study had several limitations: 1) it viewed "development" as a single continuum, ranging from emphasis on graduate education and research to service, implying that an institution can increase its attention to research only at the expense of its service mission; 2) the study lacked a base of information about national higher education trends against which to compare data from the 32 institutions; and 3) the study lacked information about state and local contexts, which would have enabled a better understanding of the development of particular institutions. Without comparative national data, observations about the distinctiveness of the urban public universities studied remained limited. Our further research in this study enlarges on the first work, and adds national, state and local data.

METHODOLOGY

In 1978, a sample of urban public universities that were in several aspects similar to our institution were selected. A survey was administered by mail to directors of institutional research or equivalent administrators.

The purposes for the 1978 survey were to identify institutions with which one or more kinds of data exchange efforts might prove of value, and to identify research topics of mutual interest which might suggest possibilities for joint research efforts.

1. The Sample

The population from which the 1978 sample was drawn consisted of all public universities that achieved university status after World War II and that were located in major cities in the U.S. The initial screening resulted in the selection of 56 institutions located in 27 states and the District of Columbia. Several of the 56 were included not because they then resembled our institution, but because they reflected what we believed our institution might become. The 56 institutions were similar to our institution in one or more of the following characteristics: enrollment size, size of metropolitan area, percentage of part-time faculty, percentage of graduate enrollment, percentage of part-time students and number of doctoral degree programs.

2. The Survey Instruments

Forty-one of the 56 institutions completed a survey in 1978. The survey requested information for Fall 1977 or fiscal year 1976-77 regarding enrollments, student characteristics, number of instructional faculty, degree programs, current funds revenue, total state appropriation and city and metropolitan area size. Respondents were also asked for copies of two HEGIS reports: opening Fall enrollment and financial statistics. A summary report, showing responses by institution, was distributed to participants (Kinnick and Ricks, 1979).

In 1988 the 41 respondents to the original survey received another mail survey. This survey included the questions asked in 1978, as well as several additional items. Respondents were asked to answer to a series of questions which required an opinion or judgment about developments at the institution (e.g., "Over the past ten years, how would you characterize the external climate for adding degree programs at your institution?"). Institutional documents, including IPEDS reports, fact books, mission statements, catalogs and lists of major programs of study were also requested. Thirty-two of the 41 institutions responding to the 1978 survey completed the 1988 survey, a response rate of 78 percent (see Figure 1)

Figure 1

The "Urban 32" Institutions

Name	Metropolitan Area
University of Alabama-Birmingham	Birmingham, Alabama
Arizona State University	Phoenix, Arizona (Tempe)
University of Arkansas-Little Rock	Little Rock, Arkansas
California State University-Fresno	Fresno, California
California State University-Hayward	Oakland, California (Hayward)
California State University-Long Beach	Los Angeles, California
California State University - Los Angeles	Los Angeles, California
California State University-San Diego	San Diego, California
University of Colorado-Denver	Denver, Colorado
University of South Florida	Tampa, Florida
Northeastern Illinois University	Chicago, Illinois
University of Illinois-Chicago	Chicago, Illinois
Wichita State University	Wichita, Kansas
University of Louisville	Louisville, Kentucky
University of New Orleans	New Orleans, Louisiana
Towson State University	Baltimore, Maryland
University of Massachusetts-Boston	Boston, Massachusetts
University of Missouri-Kansas City	Kansas City, Missouri
University of Missouri-St. Louis	St. Louis, Missouri
University of Nebraska, Omaha	Omaha, Nebraska
University of Nevada-Las Vegas	Las Vegas, Nevada
State University of New York-Albany	Albany, New York
Cleveland State University	Cleveland, Ohio
University of Toledo	Toledo, Ohio
Portland State University	Portland, Oregon
Memphis State University	Memphis, Tennessee
University of Houston	Houston, Texas
University of Texas-El Paso	El Paso, Texas
George Mason University	Fairfax, Virginia
Old Dominion University	Norfolk, Virginia
Virginia Commonwealth University	Richmond, Virginia
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	Milwaukee, Wisconsin

3. The National Data

Select national statistics on higher education for 1977 and 1987 were collected from reports issued by the U.S. Department of Education. Only estimates of 1987 enrollments are presently available. National information on minority enrollments is available only for Fall 1976 and Fall 1986 and for undergraduates only. Therefore, we discuss only undergraduate minority enrollments for our group of urban public institutions and use the base years of 1976 and 1986. These data were provided by the Office of Civil Rights, Department of Education, and reflect actual enrollment figures reported by the institutions.

4. Local Census Data

Information on the 30 metropolitan areas represented by the 32 institutions was derived from U.S. Census data. In 1980 new boundaries for metropolitan statistical areas were defined. These new metropolitan areas were not comparable to those prior to 1980. For that reason, we chose to compare data for 1980 (the first year of the new definition) with that for 1987.

5. State Data

The following data were collected on the 22 states in which respondent institutions were located: appropriations of state tax funds for operating expense; the combined state and local appropriations for higher education per FTE; and the combined state and local appropriations for higher education on a per capita basis. Tuition and fee information for "flagship" institutions in each of the 22 states was collected for 1977-78 and 1987-88.

6. Variables of Special Interest

For purposes of examining dimensions of institutional development among the 32 institutions between 1977 and 1987 the following variables were of special interest:

Access:

* percent of students served who are part-time
* percent change in numbers of part-time students served
* percent minority enrollment, undergraduate students only
* percent change in undergraduate tuition & fees
* percent of degree programs available through evening-only attendance

Graduate Education:

* percent of students served who are at the graduate level (including First Professional)
* percent change in numbers of graduate students served
* percent change in numbers of graduate degrees awarded (including first professional degrees)
* percent change in numbers of doctoral programs offered
* percent of current funds expenditure (E&G) used for research, 1986-87 only

Environmental Variables:

* percent change in metropolitan area population, 1980 to 1987
* percent population in metropolitan area by minority group, 1980 only
* percent change by State in state taxes for operating expenditures
* percent change by State in State/local appropriations per FTE
* percent change by State in State/local appropriations per capita
* percent change in full-time and part-time faculty

7. Data Analysis

Data were arrayed on Lotus 123 spreadsheets. Percent change, averages and the range of data (maximums and minimums) for the institutional data set and for the States were calculated. SAS was used on the PSU IBM 4381 mainframe for further data analyses, including Pearson *r* correlation coefficients.

For each of the two development dimensions, access and graduate programs, data from the urban institutions was compared to national averages, where available, and the differences were noted. The range of data for the set of urban institutions was examined. Responses to open-ended questions on the survey instruments, as well as environmental data, provided insight into the reasons for the changes observed.

8. Limitations of the Data Set

A major frustration for the investigators has been the lack of readily accessible national statistics on various characteristics of subsets of higher education institutions, and in particular the lack of national information describing all public four-year institutions and all four-year public universities. Further discussion of this problem may be found in the concluding section of the paper.

FINDINGS

Each of the two dimensions of institutional development, access and graduate education, are examined separately. For each dimension, two questions are addressed:

* How have these 32 institutions changed over the ten-year period?
* Are there patterns of change that characterize this sub-set of higher education institutions?

Table 1 compares the data set for the "Urban 32" with national data. A closer examination is then made of the patterns of development within the Urban 32 institutions. Next, access and graduate education

Table 1
Comparisons of Changes 1977-1987
for Urban 32 and Selected National Groups

Development Dimension	Urban 32	4-Year Public	All 4-Year	All Public	All Institutions
1. ACCESS					
1.1 Enrollments - % Change					
Headcount Enrollment	12.9	6.5	7.9	13.6	25.1
Part-Time Enrollment	21.1		11.9		24.5
Full-Time Enrollment	7.4		6.3		25.5
1.2 Minorities as % of Undergraduate Enrollment					
1976 Black	9.6		10.2		
Hispanic	4.4		4.8		
Asian/Pac. Is.	2.1		1.8		
Native American	0.5		0.7		
1986 Black	7.7		8.5		
Hispanic	5.9		6.0		
Asian/Pac. Is.	4.9		3.5		
Native American	0.5		0.7		
1.3 % Change in Average Tuition and Fees	171.9	130.4			
2. GRADUATE EDUCATION					
2.1 Enrollment - % Change					
Graduate Enrollment	10.6			-3.0	
Undergraduate Enrollment	13.5			2.2	
2.2 Degrees Awarded - % Change					
Bachelors	5.4				7.3
Masters	-8.1				-8.2
1st Professional	9.5				16.3
Doctorate	23.0				2.9
2.3 Number of Degree Programs (% Change)					
Masters	29.3				
Doctorate	48.0				
3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL					
3.1 Faculty - % Change					
Total Faculty	15.8		5.0	3.3	6.5
Full-Time Headcount	9.9				2.5
Part-Time Headcount	49.4				14.4
3.2 Metro Area Population	9.3				
3.3 State Tax Operating Expenditures - % Change	138.2				134.0
3.4 State/Local Appropriations per FTE - % Change	114.0				109.0
3.5 State/Local Appropriations per Capita - % Change	101.6				100.2

Sources:
1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1 National Center for Educational Statistics (1988) Projections of Education Statistics to 1997-98. Washington DC, US Department of Education CS 88-607.
1.2 Office of Civil Rights, US Office of Education, Washington DC. Unpublished Report, Data obtained by telephone.
1.3 College Scholarship Service, The College Board.
2.3 Institutional Surveys, Urban 32
3.2 US Bureau of the Census, through Center for Population Research and Census, PSU.
3.3 Center for Higher Education, College of Education, Illinois State U., Normal, IL Grapevine, No. 331, October 1988
3.4, 3.5 Higher Education Coordinating Board, State of Washington. "Financial Support of Higher Education in Washington - A National Comparison" 1986-87. January 1989

development are considered together for the Urban 32 (i.e., is there evidence that institutions are increasing access and at the same time expanding their role as graduate institutions?) Finally, we offer some speculations about factors influencing the patterns we have observed.

1. Access

Enrollments

As Table 1 shows, overall, enrollments in the Urban 32 grew at twice the rate as for all four-year public institutions during the ten-year period (12.9 percent for the Urban 32, as contrasted with 6.5 percent for all four-year public institutions). Part-time enrollment for the Urban 32 also grew at twice the rate of all four-year public institutions (21.1 percent for the Urban 32, as contrasted with 11.9 percent for all four-year public institutions). Growth in full-time enrollments in the Urban 32 was slightly greater than that of the public four-year institutions (7.4 percent for the Urban 32, as contrasted with 6.3 percent for the public four-year group).

Table 2 shows the percentage of full-time and part-time students in 1977 and 1987 for the Urban 32 and all four-year institutions. The Urban 32 serve a significantly higher proportion of part-time students than all four-year institutions as a group. In Fall 1987 43.7 percent of enrolled students in the Urban 32 institutions were attending on a part-time basis. The comparable figure for all four-year institutions was 30.1 percent.

Table 2
Percent Full-Time and Part-Time Enrollment
in the Urban 32 and All 4-Year Institutions
Fall 1977 and Fall 1987

	Urban 32		All 4-Year Institutions	
	1977	1987	1977	1987
Full-Time	58.4	56.3	70.9	69.9
Part-Time	41.6	43.7	29.1	30.1
Total	100	100	100	100

Within the Urban 32, there was considerable diversity in the amount of change in total enrollments and in the change in part-time enrollments. Changes in total enrollment ranged from a decline of 15 percent to an 88 percent increase. Changes in part-time enrollments showed an even wider range, from a decline of 11 percent to a gain of 338 percent. The vast majority of institutions, 26 of 32, (see Table 3) showed an increase in part-time enrollments. Respondents from 19 of the 32 institutions indicated that their universities operated under state funding structures which were unfavorable to enrollment growth, while 11 indicated positive funding incentives for growth. Respondents from two institutions indicated there were both rewards and penalties for growth. Many respondents noted that FTE-driven funding formulas often resulted in a one to two-year lag in receipt of additional funds to compensate for enrollment growth.

Environmental factors seemed to respondents to have strongly influenced enrollment. Many respondents saw population growth as the main cause for institutional growth. Local economic conditions, particularly shifts from commodity-based to service-based economies, were seen as causes for enrollment gains, and as incentives for the creation of new programs, particularly in engineering, computer science, health science, and applied science areas. Availability of scholarships and fellowships made access to these universities possible for students previously unable to attend. Respondents also mentioned increased recruitment of students by Urban 32 institutions as an important factor in enrollment growth. In several states, new requirements for continuing education for K-12 teachers brought teachers back to the classroom for graduate courses. Many respondents indicated that state system prohibitions against program duplication limited the ability of their institution to respond to perceived community needs.

Degree Programs Offered Evenings/Weekends

In the 1988 survey participants were asked about the range of courses offered at their institution during evening hours. Of the 30 responses to this question, 22, or 73 percent, indicated a full range of course offerings, while eight institutions indicated limited offerings. Thirteen respondents indicated that 25 percent or more of their institution's bachelors programs could be completed by attending only evening or weekend classes, and 18 respondents indicated that 25 percent or more of masters programs at their institutions could be completed in this manner. Sixteen respondents indicated that 50 percent or more of doctoral programs at their institutions could be completed at night and/or on weekends.

Table 3
Change in Total and Part-Time Headcount Enrollments
Urban 32 Institutions
1977-1987

Institution	% Change Headcount Enrollment	% Change Part-Time Enrollment
University of Alabama - Birmingham	7.5	11.1
Arizona State University	21.8	28.5
University of Arkansas - Little Rock	9.8	3.5
California State University - Fresno	20.4	20.5
California State University - Hayward	13.7	10.0
California State University - Long Beach	5.9	151.7
Claifornia State University - Los Angeles	-15.1	-0.4
San Diego State University	18.1	14.6
University of Colorado - Denver	18.8	8.9
University of South Florida	47.6	104.4
Northeastern Illinois University	4.2	22.9
University of Illinois - Chicago	1.2	34.7
Wichita State University	8.5	12.0
University of Louisville	12.7	28.1
University of New Orleans	13.8	25.1
Towson State University	-0.6	-10.4
University of Massachusetts - Boston	69.7	337.6
University of Missouri - Kansas City	-4.9	18.4
University of Missouri - St. Louis	4.4	29.9
University of Nebraska - Omaha	-5.5	-10.4
University of Nevada - Las Vegas	61.0	44.0
SUNY - Albany	10.5	5.4
Cleveland State University	-1.2	-5.2
University of Toledo	24.2	6.7
Portland State University	-1.7	29.9
Memphis State University	68.1	-10.9
University of Houston	-1.3	-2.8
University of Texas - El Paso	-11.2	2.5
George Mason University	88.5	79.8
Old Dominion University	10.2	4.6
Virginia Commonwealth University	11.4	6.5
University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee	3.8	10.3

Source: Survey of Urban Institutions

Minority Participation

Table 1 compares the percentages of minorities served by the Urban 32, and by all four-year degree-granting institutions. These figures are for undergraduates only. The following trends are noted both for the Urban 32 and for all four-year degree-granting institutions: a decline in the proportion of undergraduates who are Black, an increase in the proportion who are Hispanic, more than doubling of the proportion of undergraduate students who are Asian/Pacific Islanders, and little or no change in the proportion of undergraduates who are of Native American extraction.

Minority group participation differs considerably among the Urban 32. This is in large part attributable to local context; that is, the presence of various minority populations within the metropolitan area served by the institution. Table 4 compares the 1980 census data on Black and Hispanic populations for the metropolitan areas where the Urban 32 are located with enrollment figures for those groups in the 32 institutions.

Between 1976 and 1986, the percentage of Blacks in the undergraduate population increased at only seven of the Urban 32 (Table 4). In the remaining 25 institutions, the percentage of Black undergraduates declined. For Hispanics a different picture emerges. Twenty-seven of the Urban 32 showed an increase in the percentage of Hispanic students, while five showed a decrease. When the racial/ethnic backgrounds of students are compared with the racial/ethnic background of the metropolitan population, some institutions are notable for their evident success in serving one or more minority groups while others are notable for their lack of such success. Two institutions, University of Massachusetts at Boston and SUNY-Albany, are serving a higher proportion of Blacks than are represented in the population of their metropolitan areas. Thirteen, however, are serving a substantially lower proportion of Blacks than reflected in their metropolitan areas.

Five institutions are serving a higher proportion of Hispanics than present in the metropolitan area: Northeastern Illinois University, University of New Orleans, University of Massachusetts-Boston, University of South Florida, and SUNY-Albany. A sixth institution, California State University-Los Angeles, located in an area with a particularly large percentage of Hispanics in the local population, comes very close to matching that proportion in its student body. Four institutions have participation rates of Hispanic students which are substantially lower than the percentage represented in metropolitan population figures.

Table 4
Metropolitan Area Minority Population
and Minority Enrollment at Urban 32 Institutions
1977-1987

Institution	Black 1980 Census	Black Students 1976	Black Students 1986	Hispanic 1980 Census	Hispanic Students 1976	Hispanic Students 1986
University of Alabama - Birmingham	27.2	20.7	16.2	0.7	0.1	0.2
Arizona State University	3.2	2.4	2.1	13.2	4.7	5.0
University of Arkansas - Little Rock	19.1	1.8	2.2	0.9	0.3	0.8
California State University - Fresno	4.9	4.1	3.3	29.3	11.4	13.5
California State University - Hayward	15.0	15.6	9.1	10.6	3.6	6.6
California State University - Long Beach	12.6	8.8	5.6	27.6	7.2	9.1
Claifornia State University - Los Angeles	12.6	17.1	11.1	27.6	21.2	24.6
San Diego State University	5.6	3.7	3.4	14.8	5.7	8.2
University of Colorado - Denver	5.3	3.2	2.5	11.4	5.7	4.2
University of South Florida	12.9	4.7	3.6	3.7	3.2	4.8
Northeastern Illinois University	22.4	11.7	12.0	8.6	12.1	11.4
University of Illinois - Chicago	22.4	19.0	9.5	8.6	7.5	7.4
Wichita State University	7.8	6.7	5.5	2.9	1.7	1.9
University of Louisville	12.6	11.1	8.5	0.6	0.4	0.3
University of New Orleans	32.6	18.8	16.0	4.0	2.1	4.5
Towson State University	25.5	9.7	8.5	1.0	0.5	0.8
University of Massachusetts - Boston	4.7	7.4	9.6	2.5	2.9	3.2
University of Missouri - Kansas City	12.6	9.8	6.6	2.3	1.9	1.7
University of Missouri - St. Louis	17.2	12.6	8.8	0.9	0.1	0.8
University of Nebraska - Omaha	7.5	6.4	4.5	2.0	1.3	1.4
University of Nevada - Las Vegas	10.0	6.0	5.4	7.6	2.3	4.5
SUNY - Albany	3.7	4.3	4.7	1.0	2.0	2.9
Cleveland State University	15.0	12.2	10.6	1.5	0.3	0.7
University of Toledo	10.6	10.3	6.0	2.7	1.2	1.3
Portland State University	2.9	3.0	2.0	2.1	0.5	1.2
Memphis State University	39.9	16.4	17.7	0.9	0.1	0.3
University of Houston	18.8	11.3	7.4	14.7	7.6	8.5
University of Texas - El Paso	3.8	2.1	2.3	61.9	30.6	51.3
George Mason University	26.8	1.8	4.3	2.9	1.3	2.4
Old Dominion University	28.1	4.2	9.6	1.6	0.5	1.2
Virginia Commonwealth University	29.1	17.3	13.6	0.9	0.4	0.9
University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee	10.8	6.8	5.9	2.5	1.6	1.8

Source: US Bureau of the Census statistics summarized by Center for Population Research and Census, Portland State University; and Office of Civil Rights, US Department of Education, as reported in the Chronicle

Tuition and Fees

As Table 1 shows, tuition and fees at the Urban 32 have increased more than at four-year public institutions as a group: 171.9 percent at Urban 32 institutions as compared with 130.4 percent at four-year public institutions. Table 5 compares actual tuition and fee levels for the Urban 32 and all four-year public institutions.

Table 5
Tuition and Fee Levels for the Urban 32
and Four-Year Public Institutions
1977 and 1987

Tuition & Fees	Urban 32 Institutions	4-Year Public Institutions	Urban 32 as % of 4-Year Public
Average, 1977	$ 565	$ 666	84.8
Average, 1987	$1,413	$1,535	92.1
Range in 1987			
Below $1,000	7		
$1,000-1,412	10		
$1,413-1,800	9		
$1,801 +	6		

Source: College Scholarship Service, The College Board.

These data show that while tuition and fee levels for the Urban 32 remain lower than for four-year public institutions as a whole, the gap has narrowed. There is considerable diversity in 1987 annual tuition/fee levels among the Urban 32. The range for 1987 is from $718 per year (at California State University-San Diego) to $2315 per year (at Virginia Commonwealth University). At the "low" end (under $1000) are the institutions of the California State University system (California State University-Fresno, California State University-Hayward, California State University-Long Beach, California State University-Los Angeles and San Diego State University,) and two Texas institutions (University of Houston and University of Texas-El Paso. At the "high" end ($1800 or more) are the University of Illinois-Chicago, Cleveland State University, the University of Toledo, and three Virginia universities (George Mason, Old Dominion, and Virginia Commonwealth).

Correlations

There is no statistically significant correlation (using Pearson's *r* as a measure) between increases in tuition and fees and changes in total headcount enrollment, nor is there a correlation between increases in tuition and fees and percentage of part-time enrollment.

Summary

Overall, in terms of the "access" variables examined here, the picture is mixed. The Urban 32 are serving far greater percentages of part-time students than other public 4-year institutions; and the percentage of part-time students has increased. Enrollment growth rate exceeds that for all four-year public institutions. The Urban 32 serve substantial numbers of students in the evening and on weekends. In the area of access for minority populations, the Urban 32 as a group are not distinguishable from the four-year degree-granting institutions as a group. The percentage of Black students served has dropped notably while that for Asian/Pacific-Islanders and Hispanics has increased. Most Urban 32 institutions do not enroll minority students in the same proportions they are present in their metropolitan population.

Tuition and fee levels for the Urban 32, while increasing at a rate faster than that for four-year public institutions as a whole, continue to lag behind the average tuition and fee rate for public four-year institutions. In 1987 the average Urban 32 institution charged $122 less per year for tuition and fees than did the average public four-year institution. The difference in tuition and fee levels between the Urban 32 and all 4-year public institutions is decreasing.

2. Graduate Education

Enrollments

Between 1977 and 1987 headcount enrollment of graduate students in the Urban 32 increased by 10.6 percent (see Table 1). For all public institutions, the comparable figure was -3.0 percent, a decline. No national figures were available for public four-year institutions or for all four-year institutions.

Table 6 shows the stability of the percentages of undergraduate and graduate enrollments for the Urban 32 between Fall 1977 and Fall 1987. Graduate enrollments accounted for 21.8 percent of enrollment at the Urban 32 in 1977, and 21.6 percent in 1987. While headcount graduate enrollments were expanding notably in the Urban 32, the proportion of graduate students in the total enrollment remained stable.

The patterns of change among institutions in the Urban 32 are highly diverse. In terms of overall rates of change in graduate enrollment, 19 institutions increased the numbers of graduate students served while 13 showed a decrease.

Table 6
Graduate and Undergraduate Enrollment
Urban 32 and All Public Institutions
1977 and 1987

	Urban 32		All Public Institutions	
	1977	1987	1977	1987
Undergraduate (Percentage)	78.2	78.4	88.0	89.7
Graduate (Percentage)	21.8	21.6	12.0	10.3
TOTAL	100	100	100	100

As shown in Table 7 (columns 1 and 2), 17 of the Urban 32 institutions experienced a greater increase in graduate student headcount than in undergraduate headcount. Most notable increases in graduate enrollments took place at University of Arkansas-Little Rock, University of Colorado-Denver, University of South Florida, University of Illinois-Chicago, University of Missouri-St. Louis, University of New Orleans, University of Massachusetts-Boston, University of Nevada-Las Vegas, University of Houston, University of Texas-El Paso, Old Dominion University, and George Mason University. Table 7 displays select information about graduate education in Urban 32 institutions.

Graduate Degrees Granted

The Urban 32 as a group showed a significantly higher increase over the ten-year period in the numbers of doctoral degrees awarded per year than for all institutions (see Table 1). The Urban 32 institutions showed an increase of 29.3 percent as compared with 2.9 percent at all institutions. The increase in First Professional degrees awarded by Urban 32 institutions (9.5 percent) lagged behind that for all institutions (16.3 percent). Comparable decreases in master's degrees awarded were evident both at Urban 32 institutions, (-8.1 percent) and at all institutions (-8.2 percent). Data on degrees granted were provided by 28 institutions. Summarizing from Table 7, nine institutions showed an increase in Master's degrees granted while 19

Table 7
Select Characteristics of Urban 32 Universities Related to Their Role in Graduate Eduation

Institution	% Change Headcount Undergrad. 1977-87	% Change Headcount Graduate 1977-87	-- % Change in Degrees Awarded 1977 to 1987 -- Bachelor	Master	1st Prof.	Doctoral	Doctoral Programs Offered 1977	Doctoral Programs Offered 1987	% E&G Expenditures to Research 1986-87
University of Alabama - Birmingham	-8.8	7.7	18.4	-27.4	36.2	57.7	16	26	20.2
Arizona State University	17.3	23.5	24.6	-21.9	NA	-8.1	45	44	11.1
University of Arkansas - Little Rock	58.9	4.8	19.3	182.4	45.6	NA	0	1	5.2
California State University - Fresno	7.0	23.8	13.7	-25.4	NA	NA	0	0	NA
California State University - Hayward	-1.0	19.9	24.2	-11.6	NA	NA	0	0	NA
California State University - Long Beach	-19.6	14.6	-7.1	-35.2	NA	NA	0	0	NA
Claifornia State University - Los Angeles	-23.9	-11.0	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	0	NA
San Diego State University	-4.8	25.1	NA	NA	NA	NA	4	5	NA
University of Colorado - Denver	47.3	2.4	8.2	91.3	NA	NA	1	3	4.4
University of South Florida	184.2	28.3	-3.5	-1.2	1.1	-8.6	10	19	7.7
Northeastern Illinois University	1.7	5.1	-22.8	-44.3	NA	NA	0	0	0.6
University of Illinois - Chicago	88.1	-11.7	-7.0	85.0	11.8	78.8	18	40	12.6
Wichita State University	15.9	6.5	10.8	-2.4	NA	566.7	3	4	6.7
University of Louisville	-28.0	28.2	23.1	-18.8	-30.1	52.4	14	17	9.8
University of New Orleans	70.3	6.3	2.5	43.3	NA	136.4	3	8	6.3
Towson State University	-39.0	6.8	4.8	-46.7	NA	NA	0	0	0.2
University of Massachusetts - Boston	1873.0	46.9	44.1	1100.0	NA	NA	0	1	NA
University of Missouri - Kansas City	-24.2	8.5	-6.4	-21.2	-6.3	4.8	11	14	5.3
University of Missouri - St. Louis	29.2	0.4	-8.2	1.7	NA	225.0	3	4	4.1
University of Nebraska - Omaha	-2.7	-6.0	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	1.6
University of Nevada - Las Vegas	123.2	54.5	71.2	-11.5	NA	NA	5	2	7.2
SUNY - Albany	-1.5	15.8	-14.7	-30.0	NA	7.6	22	28	NA
Cleveland State University	2.6	-2.5	-9.6	2.0	-11.1	85.7	3	5	6.5
University of Toledo	-1.6	29.7	56.8	-3.3	-11.9	-9.7	10	14	3.0
Portland State University	-24.7	7.6	11.8	-2.9	NA	45.5	3	5	3.8
Memphis State University	-18.1	0.8	2.3	-35.1	3.6	2.0	11	16	5.6
University of Houston	23.2	-7.8	-30.5	20.6	39.7	6.3	27	52	12.9
University of Texas - El Paso	13.3	-14.6	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1	4.4
George Mason University	111.9	78.5	84.8	69.7	NA	NA	0	7	2.7
Old Dominion University	26.3	5.3	22.5	-18.1	NA	375.0	5	13	1.4
Virginia Commonwealth University	12.6	10.9	10.1	-12.7	0.4	95.1	16	199	15.2
University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee	4.5	3.7	-5.0	-20.8	NA	54.3	15	18	8.0

Source: Urban 32 Survey

showed a decrease. At these institutions, as well as nationally (see Table 1), fewer Master's degrees are being awarded than ten years ago.

Of the 11 institutions reporting information on First Professional degrees, seven showed an increase and four a decrease. Of the 18 reporting information on Doctoral degrees granted, 15 showed an increase and only three a decrease.

Doctoral Programs Offered

Doctoral program expansion appears to have been a priority at many of these universities over the past ten years. An expansion in the number of doctoral programs offered occurred at 22 of the Urban 32 universities. A decrease occurred at only three.

Expenditures for Research

For 1986-87, the range in the percentage of Education and General funds dollars spent for research is considerable (see Table 7), from 0.2 percent at Towson State University to 20.2 percent at the University of Alabama-Birmingham. Comparable data were not available for 1976-77.

Correlations

The Pearson *r* correlation coefficient was used to examine the relationship between the following pairs of variables: percent change in number of graduate programs, and total graduate enrollment; actual dollars spent for research, and graduate enrollment, (1986-87 only); percent of dollars spent for research, and graduate enrollment, (1986-87 only); percent change in graduate enrollment, and total headcount change; and percent change in total headcount, and part-time headcount change.

Relationships significant at the .05 level were found between dollars spent for research and graduate enrollment, and between percent of E&G budget spent for research and graduate enrollment. Relationships significant at the .01 level were found between percent change in graduate enrollment and total headcount enrollment change and also between percent change in graduate enrollment and total part-time headcount change.

Summary

A majority of the Urban 32 showed a shift of emphasis to graduate education and a notable increase in the numbers of doctoral degrees awarded and doctoral programs offered. The number of Master's degrees awarded has decreased at most of these institutions.

3. Access and Graduate Education

Figure 2 places the 32 institutions in terms of increases (or decreases) in graduate headcound and part time headcount. Footnotes indicate expansion of doctoral programs and notable service to minority populations. Seventeen institutions showed increases in both part-time enrollments and graduate student enrollments over the ten years; nine showed an increase in part-time enrollment and a decrease in graduate student enrollment; two showed an increase in graduate enrollment and a decrease in part-time enrollment; and four showed decreases in both graduate and part-time enrollments. The data do not suggest that as an institution expands its graduate education role, it decreases its service to part-time students. Of the five institutions which are serving higher proportions of black and/or Hispanic undergraduates than are present in their respective metropolitan areas, four are also institutions that have been expanding graduate education and part-time enrollments.

Figure 2
The Urban 32
Access and Graduate Education

Part-Time Headcount Enrollment	Decreasing Graduate Headcount Enrollment	Increasing Graduate Headcount Enrollment
Increasing	University of AL - Birmingham (1) Cal. State - Hayward Cal. State - Long Beach Cal. State - San Diego (1) University of Louisville (1) U. Missouri - Kansas City (1) University of Toledo (1) SUNY-Albany (1,2) Portland State University (1)	Arizona State Arkansas, Little Rock (1) Cal. State - Fresno U. Colorado - Denver (1) U. South Florida (1,2) NE Illinois University (2) U. of Illinois - Chicago (1) Wichita State (1) U. New Orleans (1,2) U. Mass. - Boston (1,2) U. Missouri - St. Louis (1) U. Nevada - Las Vegas U. Texas, El Paso George Mason University (1) Old Dominion (1) Virginia Commonwealth U. (1) U. Wisconsin, Milwaukee (1)
Decreasing	Cal. State - LA (2) Towson State Nebraska-Omaha Memphis State (1)	Cleveland State (1) University of Houston (1)

(1) Indicates institution with expansion of graduate programs between 1977 and 1987. (N = 22)
(2) Indicates institution serving heigher percentage of Black and/or Hispanic persons than the percentage present in the metropolitan area surrounding the university. (N = 7)

Finally, as shown in Figure 2, among the 22 institutions showing an increase in numbers of doctoral programs offered, 12 are also institutions showing an increase in graduate and part-time headcount. Seven, despite doctoral program expansion, show a decrease in graduate headcount and an increase in part-time

enrollments. Only two institutions (Cleveland State University and University of Houston) show a decrease in part-time enrollments while at the same time increasing graduate enrollment and doctoral degree programs. Only one institution (Memphis State University) shows an increase in doctoral programs while losing graduate enrollments and part-time enrollments.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Data Availability

A major concern resulting from this study is that of availability of national comparative data. Considerable effort is required to gather information about national trends in higher education. In particular, it has been difficult to find information about particular sub-sets of institutions against which to compare trends for the Urban 32 -- for instance, information about public four-year universities. The national data available are two to four years old by the time they reach print. Data bases should be made available to institutions in a timely manner. Perhaps this is an area in which AIR should take a stronger activist position. In particular, institutions should have access to information for particular subsets of institutions (by select characteristics or by institutional name). AIR, working with groups such as the Society for College and University Planning (SCUP), could aid in making available to institutions information about broad trends in higher education that can prove particularly helpful to researchers, planners and policy makers. The American Council on Education has made notable contributions in this area. More is needed.

Summary of Characteristics of the Urban 32

A major question posed in this investigation was "Can these urban public universities be considered a distinct grouping within higher education?"

In terms of institutional development with respect to the dimensions of access and graduate education, several observations appear warranted. First, on both dimensions the Urban 32 as a group are distinguishable from the larger group of American colleges and universities. They have a higher rate of enrollment growth. Most are located in growing metropolitan areas. They are serving disproportionately more part-time students, and part-time enrollment growth exceeds national averages. Tuition and fee levels are lower than for all four-year degree granting institutions.

Second, graduate enrollments have increased significantly compared to national trends. There has been a notable expansion of doctoral degree programs and an increase in the number of doctoral degrees

awarded. The Urban 32 appear, however, not to have expanded graduate programs at the expense of undergraduate education. The overall mix of graduate and undergraduate students has remained relatively stable; and undergraduate headcount enrollments in the Urban 32 have actually grown more than graduate enrollments.

Third, enrollment trends in the Urban 32 are not distinguishable from other institutions with respect to proportions of minority students in undergraduate populations. This surprised us and concerned us, given their location, tuition and fee levels, commitment to part-time students and accessibility of evening programs. We are concerned that as a group these institutions have not shown a greater capacity to attract and serve minority students, a challenge facing all of American higher education at present. We want to know more about the institutions that appear to have been more successful attracting minority students. In particular, we are interested in those that have simultaneously expanded graduate education and access for part-time students and are serving proportions of minority students reflective of the metropolitan areas in which they are located.

Finally, among the Urban 32 there is evidence of wide diversity in the patterns of institutional development with respect to access and graduate education. While as a group they are distinguishable in several important respects from national trends, variation within the 32 institutions is considerable, particularly with respect to serving minority students, funding for research, extent of an institutional shift of emphasis to graduate education, extent of an increase in doctoral programs and doctoral degrees, and tuition and fee costs for full-time undergraduates. The diversity in patterns of development suggests that in large part the futures of these institutions are being shaped by local conditions--economic conditions, formal mission and goals, institutional leadership, and state policy and funding environments.

The original impetus for this investigation was the interest in developing a set of information about institutions similar in one or more aspects to our institution. This information has helped us identify institutions moving in directions similar to ours, and offer visions of the kind of institution ours might become. This comparative information has already proven useful to campus planners and administrators at our institution. We believe this report, the second in a series of reports using a large data base on the Urban 32, will facilitate further comparisons, and can provide valuable information as our planning efforts progress.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to acknowledge the assistance of Rick Patrick, doctoral student in Educational Leadership at Portland State University, who provided invaluable assistance in research and in data analysis. Bernadene Pilip, Assistant to the Vice Provost for Graduate Studies at Portland State University, was co-author of the preliminary report on this project, presented at the Association for Institutional Research Forum in Phoenix, Arizona in 1988, and was responsible for the first stage of data analysis. We extend our sincere thanks to both for their collaboration.

REFERENCES CITED

Berube, Maurice. (1978) The Urban University in America. Westport, CT. Greenwood Press.

Blizek, W.L. and R.B. Simpson. (1978) The Urban University and Urban Culture. Urban Review, 10 (4), 278-286.

Grapevine No. 331 (1988) Center for Higher Education, College of Education, Illinois State University, Normal IL.

Grobman, Arnold B. (1988) Urban State Universities: An Unfinished National Agenda. New York: Praeger.

Grobman, Arnold B. and J. S. Sanders. (1978) Interactions Between Public Urban Universities and Their Cities: A Report of the Division of Urban Affairs of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

Higher Education Coordinating Board, State of Washington (1989) Financial Support of Higher Education in Washington -- A National Comparison 1986-87.

Kinnick, Mary K. and Mary F. Ricks. (1979) A Survey of Select Public Urban Universities. Portland, OR: Office of Institutional Research, Portland State University, Report #4-79.

Klotschke, Martin. (1966) The Urban University and the Future of Our Cities. New York: Harper and Row.

National Center for Educational Statistics (1988) Projections of Education Statistics to 1997-98. Washington DC. US Department of Education CS 88-607.

Ricks, Mary F., Mary K. Kinnick, and Bernadene Pilip. (1988) The Urban Public University: Analyses and Projections from a Ten Year Study. Paper presented at the 28th Annual Forum, Association for Institutional Research, Phoenix, Arizona, May 18, 1988.

Spaights, E. (1980) Toward a Definition of an Urban University. Urban Education, 15, 369-374.

Waetjen, Walter B. and John A. Muffo. (1983) The Urban University: Model for Actualization. Review of Higher Education, 6(3), 207-215.